



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,836	05/15/2006	Tak Wai Cheung	102792-214 (11363P3 US)	7492
27389 7590 08/06/2007 NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS 875 THIRD AVE 18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			EXAMINER BOYER, CHARLES I	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/595,836

Applicant(s)

CHEUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Charles I. Boyer

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/15/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: The dependency of claim 15 is incorrect. For purposes of this action, it is assumed the claim is dependent from claim 14. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Veltman et al, US 5,945,390.

Veltman et al teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, nonionic surfactant, sodium dichloroisocyanurate, and mineral oil (col. 5, lines 20-25). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Art Unit: 1751

3. Claims 1, 3, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cooper, US 5,817,611.

Cooper teaches a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, sodium dichloroisocyanurate, and mineral oil (col. 4, examples 4-10). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

4. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barford et al, US 5,711,920.

Barford et al teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, sodium dichloroisocyanurate, and paraffin (col. 4, example 3). The examiner notes that the term paraffin does not refer to a single compound, but rather is inherently a mixture of hydrocarbons, including the linear and branched paraffins claimed. As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

5. Claims 1, 3, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bunczk et al, US 5,205,955.

Bunczk et al teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, nonionic surfactant, sodium dichloroisocyanurate, and mineral oil (col. 8, examples 1, 3, and 5). As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Art Unit: 1751

6. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holdt et al, US 4,578,207.

Holdt et al teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, Cocomonoethanolamide, and paraffin (col. 5, lines 9-15). The examiner notes that the term paraffin does not refer to a single compound, but rather is inherently a mixture of hydrocarbons, including the linear and branched paraffins claimed. As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

7. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wilson et al, US 7,234,175.

Wilson et al teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, sodium dichloroisocyanurate, and paraffin or mineral oil (col. 11, examples 1-12). The examiner notes that the term paraffin does not refer to a single compound, but rather is inherently a mixture of hydrocarbons, including the linear and branched paraffins claimed. As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

8. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Norman et al, US 6,294,510.

Norman et al teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, Dibromodimethylhydantoin, paraffin wax, and mineral oil (col. 11, examples 1-12). The examiner notes that the term paraffin does not refer to a single compound, but rather is

Art Unit: 1751

inherently a mixture of hydrocarbons, including the linear and branched paraffins claimed. As this reference meets all material limitations of the claims at hand, the reference is anticipatory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holdt et al, US 4,578,207.

Holdt et al are relied upon as set forth above. Recall they teach a toilet cleansing block comprising anionic surfactant, cocomoethanolamide, and paraffin (col. 5, lines 9-15). Another example comprises anionic surfactant, sodium dichloroisocyanurate, cocomoethanolamide, and pine oil (col. 4, lines 10-24). Plasticizers of the invention include paraffin and perfume oils such as pine oil (col. 3, lines 64-65). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate paraffin into the example above and so render obvious claim 14 as paraffin is taught as a highly preferred plasticizer of the invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 15, assuming it is dependent from claim 14, is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited prior art not relied upon is cumulative to the references relied upon above. Each of these references will anticipate at least present claim 1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles I. Boyer whose telephone number is 571 272 1311. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on 571 272 1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Charles I Boyer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751